

Sanitized - Approved For Release : CIA-RDP
AUGUST 12, 1966

STATINTL

THE "NEW" CIA

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Central Intelligence Agency during recent years has performed in a frightening manner in the judgment of many thoughtful Americans. Furthermore, this Agency, which was established for the sole purpose of collecting intelligence, has become a vast bureaucracy, and in recent years has racked up one horrendous blunder after another.

It is no longer simply an intelligence collecting agency, if it ever was. Wrapped in its cloak of secrecy, it has become a policy forming agency. Even its defenders cannot deny that its actions have greatly influenced our foreign policy, and in many instances to the detriment of our Nation. The CIA was never intended to direct the foreign policy of our country, nor to influence it, but was organized to be an intelligence collecting agency, not an operating or policymaking branch of our Government.

In spending taxpayers' money, it is outspending the entire State Department with our embassies and far-flung diplomatic service and Foreign Service officials throughout the world. The CIA has become a sort of law unto itself. If it is a watchdog for the welfare of Americans, as some of its officials and employees acclaim, then truly it is a watchdog running wild without a master.

What CIA operatives have done in recent years in the Far East has in many instances been a distinct disservice to our country. With more than 300,000 men of our Armed Forces in Vietnam and Thailand and with every branch of our Armed Forces having their intelligence sections, one wonders why the many hundreds of CIA officials and operatives

in South Vietnam should not have been withdrawn long ago. Instead, they operate a sort of an army of their own, in many instances employing Vietnamese nationals, some of whom pose as Vietcong and are said to have committed dastardly acts against the civilian population of South Vietnam. Whether these latter allegations are true I do not know. I hope they are not. There is risk however when an American intelligence agency employs nationals of other nations in positions of any responsibility.

It is well-known and verified that CIA officials gave the late General MacArthur faulty information in the Korean conflict. General MacArthur disregarded his own intelligence furnished by officers of the intelligence section of his air force. He was so foolish as to believe the CIA regarding the possible intervention of Chinese troops in the Korean war. They informed him there was no possibility of Chinese volunteers crossing the Yalu and attacking us. The result was our Armed Forces in North Korea were divided, with a mountain range between them, and suddenly 200,000 Chinese "volunteers" crossed the Yalu, attacked, and drove back our forces despite their heroic resistance. General MacArthur had shortly before announced that the conflict had ended with a glorious American victory and that the boys would be home by Christmas.

There is a saying, "Experience keeps a dear school, but fools learn in no other." Unfortunately, our generals apparently have not learned the lesson of CIA ineptness and failure in Korea, in the U-2 incident of May 1960, relative to the Bay of Pigs invasion, and in several other fiascos in nations of southeast Asia, to name a few examples of CIA bungling.

Mr. President, the time has definitely come for Congress to assert a more formal and extensive supervision over the CIA. This is needed not only to eliminate waste, and to assure that its programs operate effectively and within proper constitutional limitations; more important, such congressional supervision is needed to assure that our basic standards of morality are not completely undermined in the conduct of our international intelligence activities. We cannot afford to delay asserting this supervision until such time as these activities have been publicly exposed to the jeopardy of our national security.

Mr. President, in the Cleveland Press, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, of August 9, there is a very fine and perceptive editorial entitled, "The New CIA?" and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be placed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE "NEW" CIA?

You may be wondering what's happening to the Central Intelligence Agency. The last place a super-secret spy outfit is supposed to appear is on Page One. But that's where our "spooks" keep showing up.

Recently the new director of the CIA got caught writing a letter to a St. Louis newspaper praising an editorial blasting Senator Foran. Even senators who dislike For-

an were riled. Now there's another: The case of the high-ranking CIA man accused of taking secret documents home, and his countercharge that the CIA raided his house, took the documents and then some of his wife's jewelry was found missing.

Well, don't worry. After some thought there is a choice of four explanations:

1. Those CIA people are lonely. There they are cooped up in a hush-hush headquarters on the banks of the Potomac without so much as a sign on the building. They want people to know they're alive.

2. The agency has been feeling bad about its image—cloak and dagger, rough stuff—and may have hired a public relations firm to soften the image. The PR plan: Make some prize bloopers in full public view, and the whole world will love you.

3. It may be a plot to put the Soviet counter-espionage organization to sleep. The Russian spies see the bloopers, laugh their heads off, figure their arch-foe has lost its touch and lower their guard.

4. The Central Intelligence Agency may be planning to drop its middle name.